Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to Fig(s) 1,2,3,4. The sheet(s), which includes Fig(s) 1,2,3,4, replaces the original sheet(s) including Fig(s) 1,2,3,4.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 and 17-20 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 11, 17, and 20 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 11, 17, and 20 have been amended. No new matter has been added. In the Final Rejection dated September 12, 2007, the drawings are objected to. Claims 1-15 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 1-10 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) allegedly being unpatentable over "Quickly Generating Billion-Record Synthetic Databases" by Gray et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Gray") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,647 issued to Bowman-Amuah (hereinafter referred to as "Bowman") in further view of "Practical UNIX and Internet Security, 3rd edition" by O'Reilly (hereinafter referred to as "O'Reilly"). Claims 11-15 also have been rejected under 35 U.S.C.§103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gray in view of O'Reilly. Claims 17-19 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C.§103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gray in view of Bowman. The outstanding rejections to the claims are respectfully traversed.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicants' representative on October 5, 2007.

Drawings

In the Final Rejection, the Drawings are objected to for incorrectly labeling elements 180a-180c as "computing applications" when the specification refers to them as "browsers." Figure 2 has been amended. Paragraphs [0024], [0028], [0029], and [0051] of the specification have also been amended to address inconsistency in figure element references. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to the Drawings.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Final Rejection, claims 1-15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Final Rejection alleges that "wherein the seed is defined by user input" is not supported in the specification. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants assert paragraph [0029] supports this phrase in reciting "In operation, a user (not shown) may interact with a computing application running on a client computing devices to generate repeatable synthetic data." Because setting a seed is one aspect of generating repeatable synthetic data, a user interacting with a computing application on a client computing device to generate repeatable synthetic data includes defining a seed by user input. Moreover, paragraph [0025] recites "A user may enter commands and information into the computer 110 through input devices such as a keyboard 161". Entering information with the keyboard is one means of setting a seed in order to generate repeatable synthetic data. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Final Rejection, claims 1-10 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) allegedly being unpatentable over Gray in view of Bowman in further view of O'Reilly. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 20 to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

> 1. One or more computer-readable storage media having stored thereon a set of computer-executable instructions to perform a method for generating data, the method comprising:
>
> *generating a plurality of collections of items of data each time the set of computer-executable instructions are executed, wherein each of the collections comprise contents and a sequence, and wherein the contents of each of the collections are identical and the sequence of each of the collections are identical*;
>
> accepting, as a first input, at least one of: (a) data sets and

> (b) data elements from which synthetic data is generated, said synthetic data having a sequence; and
>
> receiving a seed as a second input to a deterministic data generation module, the seed indicating a position in the sequence of the synthetic data, the position representing a starting point in the sequence from which the synthetic data is used as input to a process whose performance is to be evaluated, wherein the seed is defined by a user input.

The Final Rejection alleges that Bowman with Gray discloses generating an identical collection of items each time the set of computer-executable instruction are executed. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited sections of Bowman merely describe test data management tools, including test data generation tools that generate test data by permutation of values of fields, either randomly or systematically. By using permutations of values, Bowman explicitly disclosing generating test data that is different each time it is generated. Data based on values that are changing, or permutation of values, cannot be used to create identical sets of data. Therefore, Bowman does not disclose generating a plurality of collections of items of data each time the set of computer-executable instructions are executed, wherein each of the collections comprise contents and a sequence, and wherein the contents of each of the collections are identical and the sequence of each of the collections are identical, as claimed in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, Gray is directed to generating random data, unlike the present subject matter. The title of the section of Gray cited in support of the rejection of claim 1 in the Final Rejection is "Generating Dense Unique Random Data." This is an explicit teaching of random data generation. This section does not disclose generating identical data sets deterministically. Therefore Gray does not disclose generating a plurality of collections of items of data each time the set of computer-executable instructions are executed, wherein each of the collections comprise contents and a sequence, and wherein the contents of each of the collections are identical and the sequence of each of the collections are identical, as claimed in amended claim 1.

In order for a combination of references to render a claim obvious, they must teach and/or suggest all of the recited elements as well as the arrangements of those elements. Applicants assert that neither Bowman nor Gray disclose each and every element of claim 1 and the arrangement of those elements. Applicants further assert that O'Reilly fails to cure the deficiencies of Gray and Bowman. Like Gray, O'Reilly is directed at a random number generator, and not at deterministically generating identical data sets. Because the cited references fail to teach or even suggest all of the claimed elements, they cannot possibly render obvious claim 1 as amended. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 11, 17, and 20 have been also been amended as appropriate to further clarify the subject matter claimed therein. Applicants assert that the arguments presented above with regard to claim 1 also apply to the rejection of claims 11, 17, and 20. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 11, 17, and 20.

Applicants acknowledge that the Office Action establishes additional grounds for rejection of the claims that are dependent upon claims 1, 11, 17, and 20. However, in view of the traversals set forth with respect to the independent claims, Applicants believe that all such dependent claims are in condition for allowance, rendering the rejections of those claims moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of all claims which depend from independent claims 1, 11, 17, and 20. Applicants believe that this response completely and accurately addresses all grounds of rejection. Applicants reserve the right to challenge the rejection of any of those dependent claims in any future response that may be forthcoming.

CONCLUSION

By the amendments and remarks provided herein, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Final Office Action mailed September 12, 2007 has been traversed and that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any concerns regarding the response provided herein, or wishes to discuss the response further, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 26, 2007

/Robert A. Madayag III/
Robert A. Madayag III
Registration No. 57,355

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439